



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,538	07/03/2003	Gary Chen	MICRON.109DC1D1	9036
20995	7590	01/11/2005	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			DOLAN, JENNIFER M	
		. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2813	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,538	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer M. Dolan	2813	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 34, 35, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,957,590 to Douglas.

Regarding claims 34, 42, and 43, Douglas discloses a semiconductor stack having at least a side comprising a titanium silicide layer (22, 28; figures 2-3; top side and upper wall edges) having substantially etched titanium oxynitride extrusions formed on a side thereof (see column 3, lines 44-50; column 11, lines 15-20, 40-67; column 12, lines 20-30; titanium silicide structure is etched to remove all titanium oxynitride; hence, oxynitride extrusions are not present).

Regarding claims 35 and 44, Douglas discloses that the stack forms part of a transistor (figures 2 and 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 8-14, 20-26, 32-35, and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 06-021440 to Abiko in view of Douglas.

Regarding claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 21, 23, 25, 33, 34, 42, and 43, Abiko discloses a semiconductor structure comprising: a polysilicon layer (103); a barrier layer (104) comprising tungsten silicide over the polysilicon layer (paragraph 0008); a conductive layer (105) comprising titanium silicide (paragraph 0008); and a cap (107).

Abiko fails to specify that the silicide layers have substantially etched metal oxynitride extrusions.

Douglas discloses a semiconductor stack having at least a side comprising a titanium silicide layer (22, 28; figures 2-3) having substantially etched titanium oxynitride extrusions formed on the side thereof (see column 3, lines 44-50; column 11, lines 15-20, 40-67; column 12, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify that the semiconductor device of Abiko has substantially etched oxynitride portions, as suggested by Douglas. The rationale is as follows: A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to substantially etch any metal oxynitride portions, because Douglas shows that metal oxynitride portions typically form as by-products of the silicidation process from reactions between ambients and unreacted metal (Douglas, column 3, lines 30-50; column 4, line 60 – column 5, line 12), and that by etching the formed metal oxynitride portions, short circuits between the gate and source/drain regions can be prevented (Douglas, column 11, lines 50-65).

Regarding claims 2, 14, 26, 35, and 44, Abiko discloses that the stack forms part of a transistor (figure 1).

Regarding claims 8, 10, 20, 22, 32, and 41, Abiko teaches that the titanium silicide must be sufficiently thick to prevent undue thinning or depletion due to oxidation (see paragraph 0005), and that the tungsten silicide layer has a higher resistivity than the titanium silicide (see paragraph 0009), but fails to specify the thickness for each silicide layer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify in the device of Abiko as modified by Douglas, that the tungsten silicide layer has a thickness of about 150 angstroms, and the titanium silicide layer has a thickness of about 1000 angstroms. The rationale is as follows: A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide relatively thick silicide layers, in order to prevent undue thinning or complete depletion of the layer due to oxidation (see Abiko, paragraph 0005), but would also desire to provide relatively thin layers, in order to minimize the contact resistance of the gate (see Abiko, paragraph 0009), and especially minimize the thickness of the tungsten silicide layer, since its contact resistance is about five times as large as the titanium silicide (Abiko, paragraph 0009). Although Abiko doesn't specify the layer thicknesses, it has been held that "where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (1955).

Regarding claims 12 and 24, Abiko discloses that the polysilicon layer is above a substrate comprising silicon (paragraph 0008).

Art Unit: 2813

5. Claims 3-5, 7, 15-17, 19, 27-29, 31, 36-38, 40, 45-47, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abiko in view of Douglas as applied to claims 1, 13, 25, 34, and 43 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,376,348 to Schrems et al.

Abiko fails to specify the type of memory structure in which the disclosed FET is used.

Schrems teaches that FETs substantially similar to that of Abiko in view of Schrems, including a silicon substrate, a gate polysilicon layer (121) and metal silicide layer (122) are used in SDRAMs, static memory devices, dynamic memory devices, and wordlines for memory devices (column 3, lines 13-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify that the FET of Abiko as modified by Douglas is used as part of a SDRAM, SRAM, DRAM, or wordline structure, as suggested by Schrems. The rationale is as follows: A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the FET of Abiko in view of Douglas with the specified memory structures, because the FET of Abiko as modified by Douglas provides low contact resistance (see Abiko, paragraphs 0005-0009) and relative immunity to undue gate to source/drain shorting (Douglas, column 11, lines 50-65). Since the specified memory structures have substantially the same FET structure (see Schrems, figure 1), it is well within the purview of a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the FET of Abiko as modified by Douglas in any of the structures in order to achieve the benefits mentioned supra.

6. Claims 6, 18, 30, 39, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abiko in view of Douglas as applied to claims 1, 13, 25, 34, and 43 above, and further in view of Schrems et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,097,660 to Tsuchida et al.

Abiko is silent as to the nature of the memory structure in which the disclosed FET is used.

Schrems teaches that FETs substantially similar to that of Abiko in view of Schrems, including a silicon substrate, a gate polysilicon layer (121) and metal silicide layer (122) are used in DRAMs (column 3, lines 13-23).

Tsuchida et al. further teaches that extended data out memories refer to a common mode of operation for DRAM devices for high speed operations (column 1, lines 25-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify that the FET of Abiko as modified by Douglas is used in a DRAM, as suggested by Schrems, operating in an extended data out mode, as suggested by Tsuchida. The rationale is as follows: A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the FET of Abiko in view of Douglas in an EDO DRAM device, because Schrems teaches that a FET having substantially the same structure as that of Abiko is used in a DRAM (Schrems, column 3, lines 13-23; figure 1), and Tsuchida teaches that an EDO DRAM should have the advantage of higher speed operation, but should also have substantially the same FET configuration as any other DRAM, and hence, substantially the same configuration as that disclosed by Abiko (see Abiko, column 1, lines 25-40). Since the FET of Abiko in view of Douglas provides low contact resistance (see Abiko, paragraphs 0005-0009) and relative immunity to undue gate to source/drain shorting (Douglas, column 11, lines 50-65), it is well within the purview of a person skilled in the art to use this FET in an EDO DRAM, in order to achieve the FET advantages, as well as provide high speed memory operation.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/18/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant essentially argues that the Douglas patent does not teach forming oxynitride extrusions on an exposed side of a semiconductor structure, and then etching the extrusions.

This is not persuasive, because the invention, as claimed, is drawn to a product. Thus, any methodology in the claims is only accorded weight to the extent that it defines the claimed product (see *In re Thorpe, et al.*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985); *In re Hirao and Sato*, 190 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1976)). Hence, the manner in which oxynitride extrusions are formed and removed does not have patentable weight in these product claims, but rather is only accorded weight in that the specified semiconductor structure does not have metal oxynitride protrusions.

Douglas explicitly does teach that a metal layer is formed and reacted with silicon to form a silicide. Douglas further teaches that the unreacted metal typically reacts with nitrogen or oxygen to form titanium nitride or titanium oxynitride, and that the nitride and oxynitride substances should be etched away from the silicide layer in order to prevent undue connections (see Douglas, column 2, lines 55-65; column 4, line 60 – column 5, line 16; column 6, lines 40-51; column 11, lines 5-15, 52-65). Since Douglas teaches an etch to remove the oxynitride from the silicide, clearly there are no titanium oxynitride extrusions remaining on the top side of the titanium silicide.

The Applicant further argues that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Abiko and Douglas to remove oxynitride extrusions formed on the silicide layers. The Applicant

further points out that there is no suggestion that the structure in Abiko contains oxynitride extrusions.

The Examiner disagrees with these observations. If Abiko is considered not to have oxynitride extrusions, as the Applicant suggests, then it alone anticipates claim 1, since the implied method limitations of having oxynitride extrusions and then etching them away are only given weight in terms of the defined product – i.e. the semiconductor structure wherein the silicide layers explicitly do not have any oxynitride extrusions, as explained supra. It is more reasonable, however, to assume that Abiko does have oxynitride extrusions, since portions of unreacted metal are common after silicide formation, and such portions readily react with nitrogen and/or oxygen to form TiN/TiON projections. Since Douglas teaches that oxynitride extrusions form from unreacted metal after a silicide process, that such extrusions are undesirable and may cause shorting, and that such extrusions may be removed by etching, a person skilled in the art would find sufficient motivation to combine the teachings of Douglas with Abiko, or, in fact, with any semiconductor structure using silicide layers, in order to remove these projections.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer M. Dolan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1690. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl W. Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer M. Dolan
Examiner
Art Unit 2813

jmd

Craig A. Thompson
CRAIG A. THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER